

RFQQ BIDDER'S CONFERENCE CALL
COMMUNITY JUVENILE JUSTICE COORDINATION

FEBRUARY 16, 2006

10:00 A.M.

Questions and Answers

- 1. Is the GJJAC looking for the equivalent of the current RPDs, or is the GJJAC seeking new community-wide coalitions?**

Answer: *The GJJAC hopes to increase connections with communities that have been participating as Regional Program Development units (RPDs), and engage new communities.*

- 2. Regarding the “bidding” limit--what do you mean by “negotiating” the amount of the contract? The bidder invests time and effort to make the connections necessary to complete the proposal. Are you talking about minor “tweaking”...please elaborate.**

Answer: *There is no bid limit. Approximately \$182,500 in total funds is available. We don't anticipate negotiating line item by line item. We do expect to negotiate, if necessary, the dollar value to the communities, based on the work proposed.*

- 3. Will additional documentation (other than the proposal) be required?**

Answer: *Hopefully we will be able to incorporate the proposal into the contract, so the applicants will not be required to complete a full grant application form. However, the proposals selected for funding will be required to complete the contracting process.*

- 4. The current RPDs have conducted detention audits--will the CJJCs also be required to do detention audits?**

Answer: *No. The CJJCs will not be continuing this role. Office of Juvenile Justice staff will conduct detention monitoring in the future. Additionally, in the past RPDs were requested to review and comment on grant proposals from their communities and submit the comments to the GJJAC; the CJJC's will not be asked to provide this function.*

- 5. Is there a downside to NOT having a local CJJC in our county?**

Answer: *The GJJAC would miss the connection and viewpoints from different parts of the State. The communities would miss getting together with other CJJCs and sharing information.*

- 6. What is the rationale for not having proposals from local communities reviewed by the CJJCs? It seems that if you're trying to have a stronger local presence, this is counterproductive.**

Answer: The GJJAC has limited ability in its grant application review process to effectively incorporate the feedback provided by RPDs. Further, the GJJAC has revised its grant application review process to eliminate oral interviews. The GJJAC review process includes peer reviewers. Also, the GJJAC is encouraging RPDs to attend GJJAC meetings as an opportunity for information-sharing.

7. Referring to Attachment B, please define “confirmed” and “proposed” match.

Answer: If you have applied to a fund source and expect to receive funding, but you don’t have it yet, that is “proposed.” If it is approved and available in your budget, it is “confirmed.”

8. I am new to this process and don’t understand a lot of what you’re talking about (in the RFQQ). Is there someone that can give me technical assistance?

Answer: Yes, call Mary Williams or one of the program coordinators for assistance.

9. Is this a multi-step process and at what point do I need approval from the county council? Would the next step be to complete a grant application, if the RFQQ is accepted?

Answer: This is a multi-step process. The GJJAC will select applicants to fund; complete negotiations with projects as needed; then issue contracts. The final contract, with any negotiated areas, will need approval by all parties to the contract.

10. How will the CJJCs differ from the RPDs? What are you looking for?

Answer: We are dropping the detention monitoring, and proposal review and comment responsibilities from the statement of work. We are adding the analysis of RRI’s; the six meetings/community events (vs. four); and the analysis of local data, and selection of one strategy based on that analysis to implement/address juvenile justice issues or needs.

11. If an applicant is accepted and awarded funds, would the amount for continuation funding be the same the next year, or could it be different? Will continuation funding be at the same dollar amount as the prior year?

Answer: Yes, I believe it would be the same.

12. How closely do the CJJCs need to mirror the composition of the State Advisory Groups (JJDP Act)?

Answer: The GJJAC really values community and youth involvement. With respect to the requirement for youth participation, try something different. Typically, youth don’t like to sit in meetings. Find other ways to involve them; some states have created separate youth advisory coalitions.

The following two questions were emailed to the GJJAC/OJJ previously and were answered on the call:

- 13. Is this the same program that is listed in your January 2006 listing of currently funded programs as “Regional Program Development Units”? If not, is there a listing of currently funded programs?**

Answer: *Yes, it is the same...the CJJCs are very similar to the currently funded Regional Program Development Units, with some changes in the statement of work, as described earlier in the call (see Question #10).*

- 14. If so (yes to the above question), what is the difference between “Project Amount” and “Federal Amount”? Is the Project Amount the total amount of funding required for the project and the Federal Amount the amount provided by GJJAC to the program?**

Answer: *The federal amount is the contracted dollar amount of funding for the grant project; the project amount is the federal amount plus any additional matching funds that are reported.*

- 15. How do we value in-kind contributions? Would grant funds from JDAI and other resources, which are a part of the RPD/CJJC effort, be an in-kind contribution?**

Answer: *Examples of in-kind contributions include: the time it takes to assemble the data for the RRI report; time and effort contributed to complete the CJJC statement of work; the value of donated goods or services, such as volunteer time.*

- 16. When you prepared the RFQQ, did you have a concept of the FTE you thought would be required to complete the statement of work, such as .5 FTE? Also, what about supplanting?**

Answer: *I had not envisioned the statement of work as translating into an FTE, so I had no set FTE amount in mind.*

With regard to supplanting, if those duties are an expectation of your current job, then they could not be part of an FTE funded through the CJJC.

- 17. If you already have a similar group that meets, can you use the group to become the CJJC without causing supplanting issues? Our current staff go to so many similar community meetings and partner with other agencies. How should we address this?**

Answer: *We encourage collaboration and connecting to other groups that are already established, such as the community health and safety networks, and to maintain relationships within your communities.*

- 18. Would contracting for clerical support be allowable?**

Answer: *Yes, that would be one way to spend the grant funds.*

19. In reference to Appendix II, do you have suggestions regarding enhancing current efforts?

Answer: We are looking for your description of the process to enhance current community efforts. With the page limitations, the response needs to be concise.

20. Regarding Appendix III in the RFQQ, and the GJJAC vision, mission and priorities—would it be safe to say that addressing one of the four core requirements and a focus area is something you are looking for in responses to the RFQQ?

Answer: Yes, the organization's mission and emphasis should be complementary to the GJJAC priorities listed in Appendix III.

21. If 50% of an FTE position is assigned to complete this project, could the agency use .25 grant funds and use the other .25 of the position as match for the contract?

Answer: Yes, the difference could be a cash match/contribution for the grant (although match is not required for this grant).

The Bidder's Conference Call ended at 11:03 AM.